

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 23, 2003 has been carefully studied. The issues presented therein comprise an election of invention on the one hand and an election of species on the other hand.

With respect to the election of invention, Applicants elect group I, drawn to a composition classified in class 525, subclass various to which claims 1-16, 18-23 and 26-47 are drawn.

With respect to the restriction requirement, reconsideration is courteously requested if the Examiner does not consider the two groups to be patentably distinct. In other words, unless the Examiner is of the opinion that claim 17 which differs from claim 16 by being decorated by the process of sublimation and then coated with a transparent protective layer constitutes patentable distinctness upon which to predicate a divisional application, the Examiner should withdraw the requirement. The same is true with respect to claims 24 and 25 which are directed to coated skis.

Election of Species

Applicants, in response to the election of species requirement, elect for purposes of examination a composition comprising (A) (B) and (D), and more specifically example 9 in the table on page 22 of the specification. All claims read on this example except claims 4, 6-8, 28, 29 and 35-39. New claim 46 is substantially directed to this species and claims 45 and 47 are generic claims. It is Applicants understanding that if the Examiner cannot find a basis for the rejection of the species over the prior art, the generic claims will be examined, for example, claims 9-11.

At this juncture, Applicants also wish to disclose to the Examiner the existence of Applicants' copending application Docket No. ATOCM-246, Serial No. 10/055,907, filed on January 28, 2002. Since the same Examiner is handling both the present application and 10/055,907, Applicants will not supply a copy of said application.


In view of this response, an early action on the merits of the application is courteously requested.

Claims

The claims are amended in order to provide clarity without narrowing the scope thereof. In connection with claim 1 in particular, the term "transparent" is removed as being superfluous to the broad scope of the invention. Furthermore, Applicants emphasize that claim 1 is an open term by utilizing the term "comprising"; consequently, the last line of the claim "the difference is made up with a semi crystalline polyamide" contemplates the inclusion of components other than (A), (B), (C) and (D).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



I. William Millen, Reg. No. 19,544
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: ATOCM-245

Date: October 15, 2003
IWM:pdr insert file name and path